Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that with the ability to exchange nose-pieces quickly, which I mentioned previously, the advantages of the double nose-piece are approximately gained.

The stereoscopic effect with this form is the same as the other with considerable advantage that objects are seen much brighter. Indeed, I have shown this binocular to some persons, who were accustomed to the old form, who claimed that it had a glare, whereas it was merely the fact that it transmitted a larger amount of light than those which they had been using. The effect was somewhat similar when I attached considerably higher eye-pieces.

CATALOGUING, LABELING AND STORING MICROSCOPICAL PREPARATIONS, BY SIMON H. GAGE. (PAGE 196).

PROF. A. H. CHESTER showed a case for microscopic objects, devised by Mr. Robert Browne, Jr., of the New Haven Observatory, and similar to those in which Prof. Smith sends out his sets of diatoms. He recommended the use of a number of these small cases rather than the large case of drawers recommended by Prof. Gage. Each box holds thirty slides in a case that will easily slip into the pocket, and can be set up on the shelf of a book case. It has a movable flap-cover over the slides, on which there is a list of numbers so that the slides can be catalogued. These cases are cheap and convenient, the slides always lie flat. The outer case effectually excludes the dust, and finally, as the collection grows, the number of cases can be easily increased.

DR. BLACKHAM.—I would say that I have long made use of a plan similar to that shown by Prof. Chester, and even cheaper. I took the common rack boxes for twenty-four slides, and putting on the cover, pasted a piece of stout twilled muslin on the back and lapping over on to the cover. This formed a hinge and gave the boxes a uniform look. Each box was devoted to a special series, or class of objects, and properly labeled, and then stood up on end in a revolving book case. The slides lie flat, and my whole collection is in reach from the working table without getting out of my chair. For indexing each box I took my electric pen and made a label covering the inner side of the cover, the name of each slide is written on this, on the line opposite the slide itself as it stands in the box. These boxes are cheap, convenient and portable, and are preferable for my own use to the more elaborate and costly cabinets of drawers.

DR. J. O. STILLSON.—My trouble has not been to get a cabinet, or to preserve a history of each specimen. The desirable point with me is to get good specimens. I will, however, describe a cabinet which I had made, and it answers every purpose so far as I can see. It consists of a number of trays made of thick pasteboard. They are 9 inches wide and about 16 inches long. There are two rows of slides in each tray and 10 or 12 in each row according to the partitions which can be removed or left in. The depth of the tray is equal to the thickness of the thickest slides so that when they are in place, each lying flat, they fill the apartment. Now I have a lid to each tray, also made of pasteboard but stiffened, and made heavier by the addition of a strip of wood, such as is used in making cigar boxes. This strip extends all around the margin of the lid, and there is another across the middle the long way.

Two long openings are cut through the lid, about 2 inches wide so that when the lid is closed it will press the slides down in their places firmly, but at the same time not touch the cover glasses. High, dry and opaque mounts can be placed alongside of the thinest balsam or diatoms, and when it is desired to look for a slide the whole tray can be surveyed with the eye at a glance, and the names of 20 or 24 specimens can be read without opening the tray. When the trays are all in the box, the lid holds them firmly in place suitable for shipping. I have borders for my labels printed on fancy colored paper, I write in pencil on the wrong side of the label such a history as I desire and paste it on the slide. Then I cut my name labels out with a circular No. 8 punch, and paste these on top of the border paper. There is plenty of room to write in front the English and Latin names, date and number; by turning the slide around I read from the back through the glass the history and mode of preparation.

Dr. F. S. Newcomer.—Prof. Chester's form of cabinet, I think, is the best in use, as well as the cheapest. I have an expensive portable box or cabinet, against which I caution all. Prof. Chester's form gives ready access to your slides, and a most convenient arrangement for library or cabinet use.

Report of the Committee on Eye-Pieces. (page 175).

Mr. W. H. Bulloch objected to the report on the ground that the committee appeared to have followed the English system, which has 1.35 for the largest piece. The system is not well for America, he said, because there are no instruments here that are made according to the English system. No changes in the parts of an instrument can be made. The amplifying power of the eye-piece ought to be the basis of the standard and not the focal length. There is no make of instruments that corresponds to the standard the committee recommends. He spoke of variations that the density of the glass will cause between magnifying powers of eye-pieces that are made according to the same formula.

Dr. Blackham objected to the plan that Mr. Bulloch would adopt, because a contrary system had for a long time been in use, and all instruments in use have been constructed according to the one formula. It would require a revolution to bring about the proposed change. Much of the dissatisfaction that is charged to the system is due to the dishonesty of the makers.

Prof. W. A. Rogers said it was not fair to charge dishonesty. Their system of measurement and tests are honestly defective, and it would be almost impossible to get a system that is free from objections. Some plans have been used by makers, but they have been too expensive to the makers for their general use to be required.

The consideration of the report came up as a special order on Thursday, and on motion to adopt, the discussion was continued.